



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/682,655

10/02/2001

Igor A. Shmulevich

VIGN1330-1

5246

44654

7590

09/12/2011

Sprinkle IP Law Group
1301 W. 25th Street
Suite 408
Austin, TX 78705

EXAMINER

GOLDBERG, ANDREW C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2491

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/12/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/682,655	Applicant(s) SHMULEVICH ET AL.	
	Examiner ANDREW GOLDBERG	Art Unit 2491	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 26-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 26-45 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Art Unit: 2491

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the application filed on 02 October, 2001.

Examiners Note

2. The examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 26-45** are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chong et al., Publication No.: US 2002/0184610 A1, hereby **Chong**, in further view of

Art Unit: 2491

Chandra et al., Pub. No.: US 2002/0138582 A1, hereby **Chandra**. Comparisons to the provisional application 60/263574 will be made to be certain that the non-provisional application contains the content of the provisional application (hereby **PA**).

As an initial matter, the examiner would like to express his interpretation of instant invention to provide applicant with insight to the examiner's thought process.

The examiner interprets the instant application as a means to deliver service and device specific applications (templates) to end users. A developer may use a development environment to create a service specific template that does not include presentation data for a specific end device. The developer uses a master template which contains non-presentation based options (per se) that the developer may select in order to create the design flow of the device specific application. After the design flow has been selected, a module transforms the device specific flow into device specific presentation data.

Regarding **claim 26**, **Chong** discloses, "providing a master template which contains a plurality of building blocks, wherein each of the plurality of building blocks defines formatting for a single type of name-value pair for presentation on a single device type." **Chong** discloses in paragraph 0298 creating the visual representation of the application in the developing environment. The visual representation is NOT the application's presentation and therefore does not contain any sort of end user GUI. The visual representation is merely the interaction flow of the application or service from start to end (see figure 27 for an example). Further paragraph 0325 discloses that the visual

Art Unit: 2491

primitives (analogous to objects in the DOM) are stored in an XML format. Figure 6-9 in **PA** shows a generic example of this visual representation. Par. 0372 discloses name-value pairs; a single building block could be a single variable or object element in the IDE. The master template created in the IDE is the template that is used for multiple presentation device types. Mapped to **PA**: **PA** discloses: page 13, Covigo Mobile Application Engine. The engine converts templates designed in the visual development studio to deliver applications and services. The mobile application engine is based on XML; par. 0015, "Covigo Engine to generate the output specific to a connecting device" wherein the output is the presentation data; page 56, second paragraph; figure 6-13; page 41-42, componentization wizard);

Chong further discloses, "receiving or retrieving unformatted data from the storage device, wherein the unformatted data corresponds to a specific data service and contains no information on formatting the specific data service for presentation **Chong** discloses in paragraph 0298 that unformatted data (non-presentation data) is retrieved to make the views. Par. 0310 discloses "data view primitives" which include objects disclosed in paragraphs 0312-0317. Primitives are shown in **PA** on pages 14-15 (among others). Paragraphs, 0017, 0277, 0311, 0367 among many other paragraphs show the design of applications and services in a non-presentation type manner. In **PA**, page 13, re-usable and customizable templates, delivers applications and services; page 14, drag-and-drop visual design element; page 15, custom templates...developers do not need Covigo's out of box templates and can therefore design their own. Further, Covigo works with backend XML files. Therefore, if a user is developing his or her own

Art Unit: 2491

template, the data that is used to design said template must "correspond" aka "relate to" (in any way) a specific service.

Chong further discloses, "examining the unformatted data, each name-value pair including a name of a data item and a value of the data item; presenting the name-value pairs to a user via the user interface." In **Chong**, figure 17 shows a sample design of an application with elements each containing a name and a value that is shown when a user clicks on said element. In PA, figure 6-13; page 41-42, componentization wizard, components are saved in an XML repository);

Chong further discloses, "...wherein each of the service/device-specific templates is specific to a corresponding device or a device type and to the specific data service associated with the unformatted data (**page 13, Covigo Mobile Application Engine. The engine converts templates designed in the visual development studio to deliver applications and services; par. 0015, "Covigo Engine to generate the output specific to a connecting device" wherein the output is the presentation data.**).

Chong does not explicitly disclose, "...retaining a set of the name-value pairs based on user input received via the user interface...selecting, from the master template, building blocks containing information on formatting the set of the name-value pairs for presentation of the specific data service on a plurality of device types...assembling the building blocks selected from the master template into one or more service/device-specific templates." The examiner is interpreting this limitation to mean that a user is selecting from a list of building blocks in order to create his or her own specific application.

Art Unit: 2491

However, regarding **claim 1**, **Chandra** discloses the concept of selecting building blocks from a list to incorporate into a transportable application (par. 0443-0467).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of **Chong and Chandra** before him or her, to modify the master template creation of **Chong** to include the ability to pick and choose building blocks for specific application templates as in **Chandra**. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to customize a specific application from the previously created master template of Chong.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine **Chandra** with **Chong** to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

Regarding **claim 27**, **Chong** discloses, “utilizing the service/device-specific templates to create markup language files for corresponding devices” (Chong: par. 0310 - PA: page 15).

Regarding **claim 28**, **Chong** discloses, “utilizing the markup language files to accommodate the specific data service on the corresponding devices” (par. 0310 - page 15).

Regarding **claim 29**, **Chong** discloses, “wherein the master template defines predetermined style for displaying data on physical devices” (par. 0298, module 16 - page 15).

Regarding **claim 30**, **Chong** discloses, “wherein the master template is one of a plurality of master templates, each defining a different style for displaying data on physical devices” (par. 0299 - page 15, dynamic content generation).

Regarding **claim 31**, **Chong** discloses, “prompting the user to select one of the plurality of master templates according to which the service/device-specific templates are generated” (par. 0299 - page 63, number 12).

Regarding **claim 32**, **Chong** discloses, “wherein the service/device-specific templates are generated automatically upon completion of the master template” (page 15, code generator).

Regarding **claim 33**, **Chong** discloses, “wherein the service/device-specific templates are generated as needed to accommodate the specific data service or a new data service” (page 15).

Regarding **claim 34**, **Chong** as modified by **Chandra** discloses, “presenting the user with a name for each of the set of the name-value pairs; and allowing the user to accept or modify the name via the user interface” (figure 6-13; page 41-42, componentization wizard, components are saved in an XML repository; Chandra, par. 0764 rename building block).

Claims 35-45 are rejected under the same reasoning and motivation as above.
No new substantial limitations or concepts have been added.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. A new final rejection has been provided.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, this action is made **final**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW GOLDBERG whose telephone number is (571)270-5441. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 2491

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ashok Patel can be reached on (571)-272-3972. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Goldberg
Examiner
Art Unit 2491

/Andrew Goldberg/
02/12/2011

/Ashok B. Patel/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2491